



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,824	11/24/2003	Richard Mark Hindley	P30195D2C2	5354

7590 10/17/2005

GLAXOSMITHKLINE  
Corporate Intellectual Property - UW2220  
P.O. Box 1539  
King of Prussia, PA 19406-0939

EXAMINER
----------

O'SULLIVAN, PETER G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1621

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/720,824	Applicant(s) HINDLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter G. O'Sullivan	Art Unit 1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/244,263.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

Art Unit: 1621

Claims 18-36 are pending in this application which should be reviewed for errors.

Applicants' are requested to send copies of the non-patent references listed on their 1449 with their next response.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 18-36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 42 of U.S. Patent No. 5,002,953 and claims 1 and 2 of US 5,741,803. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present compounds differ merely in being the optical isomers thereof (see *In re Adamson et al.*, 125 USPQ 233). US. 5,002,953, column 3, lines 48-51, discloses stereoisomeric forms, individual isomers and mixtures of isomers. In US 5,741,803, see column 2, lines 54-56.

Claims 18-36 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of of copending Application No. 10/389,381, in view of Hindley, US 5,002,953. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

Art Unit: 1621

because present compounds differ merely in being the optical isomers thereof (see In re Adamson et al., 125 USPQ 233). US. 5,002,953, column 3, lines 48-51, discloses stereoisomeric forms, individual isomers and mixtures of isomers. In US 5,741,803, see column 2, lines 54-56.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Since the inventive entities of the present application and US 5,002,953, US 5,741,803 or 10/389,381 differ, a showing of common ownership at the time the invention was made is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1621

Claims 18-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hindley (US 5,002,953), Pool et al., US 5,741,803, or EP 306,228, of record. Hindley in example 30 and claim 42, Pool et al. in examples 1 and 2 and claims 1 and 2, and EP 306,228 in example 30 disclose 5-(4-[2-(N-methyl-N-(2-(pyridyl)amino)ethoxy]benzyl)thiazolidine-2,4-dione and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof. As noted in the obviousness-type double patenting rejection above, the present compounds differ merely in being the optical isomers of the compounds of the patents. It would have been prima facie obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the present isomers of the known pharmaceutical racemates and to expect to obtain additional useful pharmaceuticals. In the absence of a showing of unexpected beneficial properties, no patentable significance is seen in the present selection.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Peter G. O'Sullivan at telephone number (571)272-0642.



PETER O'SULLIVAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200